

### REMARKS

Claims 1-47 are pending in this application, with claims 1-7, 16, 25 and 33-35 being independent. Claims 1-7, 16, 25 and 33-35 have been amended, and new claims 36-47 have been added. Support for the amendments and the new claims may be found in the application at, for example, page 15, lines 21-24. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 33 and 34 have been rejected as being anticipated by McAuliffe (U.S. Patent No. 5,838,790). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because McAuliffe does not describe or suggest a display device mounted on means for transportation, as recited in each of amended claims 33 and 34.

Claims 2 and 4 have been rejected as being anticipated by Bennett (U.S. Patent No. 6,615,172). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Bennett does not describe or suggest a display device mounted on means for transportation, as recited in each of amended claims 2 and 4.

Claims 3, 5, 6 and 35 have been rejected as being anticipated by Braden-Harder (U.S. Patent No. 5,933,822). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Braden-Harder does not describe or suggest a display device mounted on means for transportation, as recited in each of amended claims 3, 5, 6 and 35.

Claim 25 and its dependent claims 26-29 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Braden-Harder in view of Ramasubramani (U.S. Patent No. 6,516,316). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Braden-Harder, Ramasubramani, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests a display device mounted on means for transportation, as recited in amended claim 25.

Claims 7 and 16, their dependent claims 8-15, 17-22, 23 and 24, and claims 30-32 (which depend from claim 25) have been rejected as being unpatentable over Braden-Harder in view of Ramasubramani and McAuliffe. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Braden-Harder, Ramasubramani, McAuliffe, nor any proper combination of the three describes or suggests a display device mounted on means for transportation, as recited in amended independent claims 7, 16 and 25.

Applicant : Masaaki Hiroki  
Serial No. : 09/880,986  
Filed : June 13, 2001  
Page : 14 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 07977-278001 / US4986

Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Braden-Harder in view of Ramasubramani and Teare (U.S. Patent No. 6,151,624). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Braden-Harder, Ramasubramani, Teare, nor any proper combination of the three describes or suggests a display device mounted on means for transportation, as recited in amended claims 1 and 2.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Enclosed is a \$1,510 check (\$790 for Request for Continued Examination fee, \$600 for excess claim fees and \$120 for the Petition for Extension of Time fee). Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

9/13/05

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John F. Hayden  
Reg. No. 37,640

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331